

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Tamela S. Kline,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Civil Action No.: 2:17-0244-TLW
	)	
v.	)	
	)	<b>ORDER</b>
Nancy A. Berryhill, Commissioner	)	
of Social Security,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

Plaintiff Tamela S. Kline (Plaintiff) brought this action to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the Defendant Nancy A. Berryhill, Commissioner of Social Security (Commissioner), denying her claims for Supplemental Security Income. ECF No. 1. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (the Report) filed on May 3, 2018, by United States Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), (D.S.C.). ECF No. 19. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends reversing the Commissioner’s decision and remanding the case. *Id.* On May 14, 2018, the Commissioner filed a notice that there are no objections to the Report. ECF No. 20. This matter is now ripe for disposition.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, “a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v.*

*Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report, case law, and other relevant filings and notes that the Commissioner has no objection to the Report. ECF No. 20. After careful consideration, the Court concludes that it is appropriate to remand this case for further consideration and discussion of the listed impairments in 20 C.F.R. 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1.<sup>1</sup> It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Report, ECF No. 19, is **ACCEPTED**. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Commissioner's decision is **REVERSED** and this case is **REMANDED** for further proceedings consistent with the Report and with this Order.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Terry L. Wooten  
TERRY L. WOOTEN  
Chief United States District Judge

May 29, 2018  
Columbia, South Carolina

---

<sup>1</sup> As noted in the Report, the Court need not address Plaintiff's remaining arguments because they may be rendered moot on remand.